

original pages showing the revisions. No new matter has been added.

The following remarks address the rejections outstanding from the parent application. In the parent application, each of independent Claims 1, 7, and 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gove. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 recites an image processing apparatus comprising, inter alia, display means for displaying an operation picture containing indicia corresponding to a plurality of image processing functions among which a selection can be made by an external operation, position input means including a portion placed over a screen of the display means to detect a touch operation as the external operation, and output means for outputting the operation picture to an external display device. The position input means has a first operating mode to enter a position designated by the touch operation as an absolute position on the operation picture displayed by the display means. It also has a second operating mode in which, when the operation picture is output to the external display device, the position designated by the touch operation is entered as a relative position on the operation picture displayed on the external display device.

Gove neither teaches nor suggests the aforementioned features of Claim 1. While Gove indeed teaches the use of a touch screen as observed by the Office, Gove does not disclose that the touch screen covers a portion of a display means that displays an operation picture that can also be output to an external display device. Nor does Gove teach entering positions designated on his touch screen as absolute and relative positions on internally and externally displayed operation pictures, respectively.

Autry et al., which was cited in connection with certain dependent claims, fails to overcome the fundamental deficiencies of Gove with respect to Claim 1 as discussed above. Accordingly, Claim 1 should now be allowed.

Regarding Claim 7, Gove fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination including a position input portion which inputs a position designated by the operator on the operation picture displayed by the external display device. The Office's reference to Gove column 2, lines 44-46 and column 3, lines 16-24 is duly noted. However, the cited portion in column 2 relates to the use of a position sensor to allow compensation for patient motion, whereas the cited portion of column 3 refers to data input via a touch screen, etc. These teachings do not relate to position designation on an

externally displayed operation picture, as in the invention of Claim 7.

Claim 7 thus distinguishes patentably from Gove. As with Claim 1, Autry et al. does not overcome Gove's deficiencies relative to Claim 7.

Independent Claim 13 is a method claim analogue of Claim 7 and should be allowed for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are of course allowable for at least the same reasons as their underlying base claims.

A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1165 any fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 that may be required by this paper and to credit any overpayment to that Account. If any extension of time is required in connection with the filing of this

paper and has not been requested separately, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,


By: 

Mitchell W. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 31,568

Miles & Stockbridge P.C.  
1751 Pinnacle Drive  
Suite 500  
McLean, Virginia 22102-3833  
Tel: (703) 610-8652

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

  
Mitchell W. Shapiro

March 29, 2001  
Date